UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,483 03/31/2004		Gerald L. Dybsetter	15436.366.1	7758
22913 Workman Nyde	7590 04/02/201 egger	10	EXAMINER	
1000 Eagle Gat	e Tower		PATEL, NIMESH G	
60 East South Temple Salt Lake City, UT 84111			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2111	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/02/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/814,483	DYBSETTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	

	NIMESH G. PATEL	2111	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 19 March 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply original.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed in the proposed in the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims. 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); er form for appeal by materially rec	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying tl	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.124. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.125. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	16 and 41.33(a)). 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (l	,
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-40. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	I sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application ir	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Mark Rinehart/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2111			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to the claims raise new issues and would require further search/consideration. Specifically, the added limitation of "interspersing a bit at a guaranteed minimum" has not previously been presented as now stated for consideration in the independent claims and all claims depending from the independent claims are changed in scope from what was previously considered and searched by incorporation of the proposed amendment.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As to Applicant's assertion that no reference has been provided to support the official notice of an interpersed bit, Examiner respectfully disagrees. As evidence, a definition of bit stuffing has been supplied with the office action mailed on July 25, 2008, which reference is made to in the office action. See PTO-892, dated 7/25/2008, reference item "U." Bit stuffing is used to prevent data being interpreted as control information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use zero stuffing since this will prevent consecutive bits of data being confused with the preamble of consecutive bits. The Examiner notes that no substantive traversal of the supporting reference has been presented and that Applicant's response merely challenges whether a reference supporting Examiner's assertion has been supplied. Therefore, Applicant's arguments are not deemed to be persuasive at this time.